

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 31-35 without prejudice. Claims 1-14, 16-30 and 36 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 13-14, 16-18, 20-23, 24-26, 29 and 36 are amended. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 5 (line 18) through page 6 (line 6), page 17 (lines 15-18), and page 19 (lines 1-2 and 17-21) of the application.

103 Rejections

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-14, 16-30 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article by A. Bindra dated November 6, 2000, "Programmable SoC Delivers a New Level of System Flexibility" (hereinafter, "Bindra"), in view of the article by J. Hamblen dated June 2000, "Rapid Prototyping Using Field-Programmable Logic Devices" (hereinafter, "Hamblen"). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is not shown or suggested by Bindra and Hamblen, alone or in combination.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Bindra nor Hamblen nor the combination thereof shows or suggests a user interface that can be used to receive user-specifiable information about a user module, where the user-specifiable information is subsequently used in the construction of, for example, source code that includes configuration information that can be loaded into a register of a physical block so that the block implements a specified function, as recited in the independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent Claims 13, 17, 21, 25 and 26.

Bindra's Figure 4 shows a user interface that displays global resources and another user interface that displays user module parameters. However, there is no showing or suggestion in Bindra that those resources or parameters are user-specifiable values, nor is there any showing or suggestion in Bindra with regard to what the displayed resources or parameters represent or how they are established and/or used.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Bindra does not show or suggest substituting user-specifiable values as defined by the claims into, for example, template assembly code as recited in independent Claims 13, 17, 21 and 25 and as similarly recited in Claim 36.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Bindra does not show or suggest substituting user-specifiable values as defined by the claims into a template file before derivatives of the template file (e.g., assembly, include and header files) are compiled, as recited in Claim 36.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hamblen does not overcome these shortcomings of Bindra. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Hamblen, alone or in combination with Bindra, does not show or suggest the claim limitations discussed above. Hamblen mentions a meta-assembler that lets a user define instruction formats and opcodes. However, as understood by the Applicant, Hamblen does not appear to show or suggest: a user interface that can be used to receive user-specifiable information about a user module, where the user-specifiable information is subsequently used in the construction of source code or assembly code; template assembly code; the substitution of

values into such assembly code; nor the substitution of such values into a template file before a compiling step.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 13, 17, 21, 25, 26 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Each of the Claims 2-12 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims 14 and 16 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 13 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims 18-20 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 17 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims 22-24 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 21 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims 27-30 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 26 plus additional limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that Bindra and Hamblen, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 2-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 22-24 and 27-30 in combination with the limitations of their respective base claims, and also that Claims 2-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 22-24 and 27-30 are in condition for allowance as depending from allowable claims. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 22-24 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed and that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1-14, 16-30 and 36 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of these claims is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any associated fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES LLP

Date: 8-19-2008

/William A. Zarbis/

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060